arXiv:1609.03862v1 [physics.gen-ph] 10 Sep 2016

Induction and physical theory formation by Machine Learning

Alexander Svozil
Consortium on Machine Learning (CML), Vienna Lab, Wasnergasse 13, A-1200 Vienna, Austria[*]

Karl Svozil
Institute for Theoretical Physics, Vienna University of Technology, Wiedner Hauptstraße 8-10/136, A-1040 Vienna, Austria and Department of Computer Science, University of Auckland, Private Bag 92019, Auckland 1142, New Zealand[†]

Machine learning presents a general, systematic framework for the generation of formal theoretical models for physical description and prediction. Tentatively standard linear modeling techniques are reviewed; followed by a brief discussion of generalizations to deep forward networks for approximating nonlinear phenomena.

PACS numbers: 02.10.Ud, 02.10.-v, 03.65.Ca, 01.70.+w
Keywords: machine learning, induction

I. ALGORITHMIC INDUCTION

There appear to be at least two approaches to induction. The first route is by intuition and ingenuity. It has been successfully pursued by geniuses and gifted individuals. A typical representative of this approach to knowledge is Ramanujan who seemed to have attributed his revelations to a Hindu Goddess [1]. In western thought, this is often more secularly referred to as Platonism. Gödel seemed to have held the opinion that our minds have access to truth, which can be discovered through personal insights – maybe even beyond the bounds of universal computability – in particular, that *minds are not (Turing) machines* [2, p. 216]. As successful these narratives may have been, they remain anecdotal and cannot be generalized.

When it comes to *ad hoc* revelations of individuals, there may also be psychological issues. These have been described by Freud [3], pointing to the dangers caused by "temptations to project, what [the analyst] in dull self-perception recognizes as the peculiarities of his own personality, as generally valid theory into science." A similar warning comes from Jaynes' warning against the "Mind Projection Fallacy" [4, 5], pointing out that *"we are all under an ego-driven temptation to project our private thoughts out onto the real world, by supposing that the creations of one's own imagination are real properties of Nature, or that one's own ignorance signifies some kind of indecision on the part of Nature.*

A second approach could be conceived in the spirit of Turing [6]. In this line of thought, it is possible to obtain knowledge about a system by mechanical, algorithmic procedures; such as a deterministic agent *"provided with paper, pencil and rubber, and subject to strict discipline [carrying out a set of rules of procedure written down]"* [7, p. 34]. Recently one of the more promising approaches to algorithmic induction has been machine learning [8].

Two *caveats* should be stated upfront. First, the general induction problem is unsolvable with respect and relative to universal computational capacities [9–12]. So, in certain (even constructible) situations machine learning, like all other algorithmic induction strategies, provably fails. But that does not exclude heuristic methods of induction, such as machine learning applied to physical phenomena. Second, theoretical constructions cannot be expected to faithfully represent the "laws underlying" a phenomenology. As Lakatos [13] points out, the progressiveness and degeneracy of research programs are transient. In this approach the "explanations" and theoretical models generated by machine learning present knowledge and explanations which cannot claim to have any ontological, only epistemic, relevance – they are means relative to the methods employed.

Whereas machine learning has already been applied to very specific problems in high energy [14] and solid state physics [15], we would like to propose it as a very general method of theory formation and induction.

II. LINEAR MODELS OF INERTIAL MOTION

In what follows a *linear regression* model [8, Sect. 5.1.4] will be used. Thereby we shall, if not stated explicitly otherwise, closely follow the notation of Mermin's book on *Quantum Computer Science* [16].

Suppose, for the sake of demonstration, a one-dimensional physical system of a particle in inertial motion. Suppose further that it has been (approximately) measured already at $n \geq 2$ positions $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ at times $t_1, \ldots, t_n$, respectively. The goal is to find a general algorithm which could predict where its location at an arbitrary time τ.

In what follows the respective positions and times are (not necessarily successively) arranged as n-tuples; that is, as a finite ordered list of elements, and interpreted as

* alexander.svozil@gmail.com
† svozil@tuwien.ac.at; http://tph.tuwien.ac.at/~svozil

$(n \times 1)$-matrices

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbf{x}\rangle &\equiv \left(x_{i_1}, \ldots, x_{i_n}\right)^\intercal \\ |\mathbf{t}\rangle &\equiv \left(t_{i_1}, \ldots, t_{i_n}\right)^\intercal ; \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

whereby the superscript $^\intercal$ indicates transposition, and $i_1, \ldots, i_n$ are arbitrary permutations of $1, \ldots, n$. That is, it is not necessary to order the events temporally; actually they can "run backwards" or be randomly arranged [17].

A linear regression *Ansatz* is to find a linear model for the prediction of some unknown observable, given some anecdotal instances of its performance. More formally, let y be an arbitrary observable, which depends on n parameters $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ by linear means, that is, by

$$y = \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i r_i = \langle \mathbf{x}|\mathbf{r}\rangle, \tag{2}$$

where $\langle \mathbf{x}| = (|\mathbf{x}\rangle)^\intercal$ is the transpose of the vector $|\mathbf{x}\rangle$, the tuple

$$|\mathbf{r}\rangle = \left(r_1, \ldots, r_n\right)^\intercal \tag{3}$$

contains the unknown weights of the approximation – the "theory," if you like – and $\langle \mathbf{a}|\mathbf{b}\rangle = \sum_i a_i b_i$ stands for the Euclidean scalar product of the tuples interpreted as (dual) vectors in n-dimensional (dual) vector space $\mathbb{R}^n$.

Given are m known instances of (2); that is, m pairs $\left(z_j, |\mathbf{x}_j\rangle\right)$ are known. These data can be bundled into an m-tuple

$$|\mathbf{z}\rangle \equiv \left(z_{j_1}, \ldots, z_{j_m}\right)^\intercal , \tag{4}$$

and an $(m \times n)$-matrix

$$\mathbf{X} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} x_{j_1 i_1} & \ldots & x_{j_1 i_n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ x_{j_m i_1} & \ldots & x_{j_m i_n} \end{pmatrix} \tag{5}$$

where $j_1, \ldots, j_m$ are arbitrary permutations of $1, \ldots, m$, and the matrix rows are just the vectors $|\mathbf{x}_{j_k}\rangle \equiv \left(x_{j_k i_1} \ \ldots, x_{j_k i_n}\right)^\intercal$.

The task is to compute a "good" estimate of $|\mathbf{r}\rangle$; that is, an estimate of $|\mathbf{r}\rangle$ which allows an "optimal" computation of the prediction y.

Suppose that a good way to measure the performance of the prediction from some particular definite but unknown $|\mathbf{r}\rangle$ with respect to the m given data $\left(z_j, |\mathbf{x}_j\rangle\right)$ is by the mean squared error (MSE)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{MSE} &= \frac{1}{m} \left\| |\mathbf{y}\rangle - |\mathbf{z}\rangle \right\|^2 = \frac{1}{m} \left\| \mathbf{X}|\mathbf{r}\rangle - |\mathbf{z}\rangle \right\|^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{m} \left(\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{r}\rangle - |\mathbf{z}\rangle\right)^\intercal \left(\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{r}\rangle - |\mathbf{z}\rangle\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{m} \left(\langle \mathbf{r}|\mathbf{X}^\intercal - \langle \mathbf{z}|\right) \left(\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{r}\rangle - |\mathbf{z}\rangle\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{m} \left(\langle \mathbf{r}|\mathbf{X}^\intercal\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{r}\rangle - \langle \mathbf{z}|\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{r}\rangle - \langle \mathbf{r}|\mathbf{X}^\intercal|\mathbf{z}\rangle + \langle \mathbf{z}|\mathbf{z}\rangle\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{m} \left[\langle \mathbf{r}|\mathbf{X}^\intercal\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{r}\rangle - \langle \mathbf{z}| \left(\langle \mathbf{r}|\mathbf{X}^\intercal\right)^\intercal - \langle \mathbf{r}|\mathbf{X}^\intercal|\mathbf{z}\rangle + \langle \mathbf{z}|\mathbf{z}\rangle\right] \\ &= \frac{1}{m} \left\{\langle \mathbf{r}|\mathbf{X}^\intercal\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{r}\rangle - \left[\left(\langle \mathbf{r}|\mathbf{X}^\intercal\right)^\intercal\right]^\intercal |\mathbf{z}\rangle \right. \\ &\qquad \left. - \langle \mathbf{r}|\mathbf{X}^\intercal|\mathbf{z}\rangle + \langle \mathbf{z}|\mathbf{z}\rangle\right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{m} \left(\langle \mathbf{r}|\mathbf{X}^\intercal\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{r}\rangle - 2\langle \mathbf{r}|\mathbf{X}^\intercal|\mathbf{z}\rangle + \langle \mathbf{z}|\mathbf{z}\rangle\right). \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

In order to minimize the mean squared error (6) with respect to variations of $|\mathbf{r}\rangle$ one obtains a condition for "the linear theory" $|\mathbf{y}\rangle$ by setting its derivatives (its gradient) to zero; that is

$$\partial_{|\mathbf{r}\rangle} \mathrm{MSE} = \mathbf{0}. \tag{7}$$

A lengthy but straightforward computation yields

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{\partial}{\partial r_i} \left(r_j \mathbf{X}^\intercal_{jk} \mathbf{X}_{kl} r_l - 2 r_j \mathbf{X}^\intercal_{jk} z_k + z_j z_j\right) \\ &= \delta_{ij} \mathbf{X}^\intercal_{jk} \mathbf{X}_{kl} r_l + r_j \mathbf{X}^\intercal_{jk} \mathbf{X}_{kl} \delta_{il} - 2\delta_{ij} \mathbf{X}^\intercal_{jk} z_k \\ &= \mathbf{X}^\intercal_{ik} \mathbf{X}_{kl} r_l + r_j \mathbf{X}^\intercal_{jk} \mathbf{X}_{ki} - 2\mathbf{X}^\intercal_{ik} z_k \\ &= \mathbf{X}^\intercal_{ik} \mathbf{X}_{kl} r_l + \mathbf{X}^\intercal_{ik} \mathbf{X}_{kj} r_j - 2\mathbf{X}^\intercal_{ik} z_k \\ &= 2\mathbf{X}^\intercal_{ik} \mathbf{X}_{kj} r_j - 2\mathbf{X}^\intercal_{ik} z_k \\ &\equiv 2\left(\mathbf{X}^\intercal\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{r}\rangle - \mathbf{X}^\intercal|\mathbf{z}\rangle\right) = 0 \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

and finally, upon multiplication with $\left(\mathbf{X}^\intercal\mathbf{X}\right)^{-1}$ from the left,

$$|\mathbf{r}\rangle = \left(\mathbf{X}^\intercal\mathbf{X}\right)^{-1} \mathbf{X}^\intercal|\mathbf{z}\rangle. \tag{9}$$

A short plausibility check for $n = m = 1$ yields the linear dependency $|\mathbf{z}\rangle = \mathbf{X}|\mathbf{r}\rangle$.

Coming back to the one-dimensional physical system of a particle in inertial motion, we could characterize inertial motion in machine learning and linear regression terms by the requirement that the Ansatz (2) is "good" in the sense that predictions can be made to a "sufficient degree" (a term which is arbitrary, subjective and thus conventional); that is, within a pre-defined error.

If the particle does not pass through the origin, it might be necessary to augment Eq. (2) with an affine term b, which can be absorbed into $|\mathbf{x}'\rangle = \left(x_1, \ldots, x_n, 1\right)^\intercal$ and $|\mathbf{r}'\rangle = \left(r_1, \ldots, r_n, b\right)^\intercal$ such that

$$y = \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i r_i = \langle \mathbf{x}|\mathbf{r}\rangle + d = \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} x'_i r'_i. \tag{10}$$

III. NONLINEAR MODELS OF NONINERTIAL MOTION

The linear Ansatz (2) fails for noninertial motion. One possible way to cope with nonlinearities would be to introduce extra dimensions corresponding to nonlinear terms, such as x^l for $2 \leq l \leq d < \infty$; with the consequence that the dimensionality of the parameter space increases.

In order to cope with nonlinear phenomena, *deep forward networks* have been used in machine learning [8, Chapt. 6]. This strategy of deep learning invokes intermediate *hidden theoretical layers* of description which communicate with each other. For the sake of an example, suppose there are two functions g and h, connected in a chain by functional substitution, such that $f(x) = h(g(x))$. The length of the chain is identified with the *depth* of the model – in this case two. g is the first layer of the model. The final layer – in this case h – is called the *output layer*.

Unfortunately, the linear regression Ansatz (10) for g and h would effectively be linear again. Therefore, in order to model a nonlinear phenomenology, a nonlinear Ansatz for at least one layer. Such networks are capable of approximating any Borel measurable function (and its derivative, even if it a generalized function) from one finite dimensional space to another [18–20].

However, it could be suspected that, despite the fact that this approximation is "good," the task of finding such an approximation might not be constructive. Indeed, because if such a learning would be computable as it may imply the (approximate) "solution" of the general rule inference problem [9–12], which it turn can be reduced to the halting problem of universal computers. This is not dissimilar to solutions of the n-body problem [21], which, if the system encodes a universal computer, turn out to be uncomputable [22].

IV. DISCUSSION

One objection for applying machine learning algorithms to physical theory creation might be that it lacks "meaning;" that is, that it amounts to pure syntax devoid of any semantics. If the semantics is omitted, there can be no true "understanding" of the "physics behind" the phenomena.

One may counter this criticism by noticing that, first, underlying such objections is the premise that there actually *is* something to be discovered or revealed. This realistic ontology is by far nontrivial, and is heavily debated [23]. If, for example, the phenomena emerge from primordial chaos, such as in Greek mythology and cosmology, χάος, then any "meaning" one might present and "discover" ultimately remains a (pragmative) narrative, or a mathematical abstraction such as Ramsey theory at best: for any data, there cannot be no correlations – regardless of the origin or type of empirical data, there always has to be some, maybe spurious [24], regularity or coincidences or properties. How can it be excluded that the laws of physics are nothing but yet undiscovered consequences of Ramsey theory?

Second, as has already been pointed out, historic evidence seems to suggest that successive physical models (say, of gravity) are not continuously evolving; but that they are disruptive and dissimilar [13, 25]. One may even go so far as to suggest that, in any case, theories are (more or less [26]) successful believe systems; very much like Greek mythology [27].

Third, also the present perception of the quantum mechanical formalism includes, among other inclinations, the position that no interpretation is necessary [28]; that indeed, interpretation is even dangerous and detremental for the researcher [29, p. 129]; or that, at the very least, there are no issues with respect to interpretation [30].

Nevertheless it might be quite amusing to study toy universes capable of universal computation, such as Conway's *game of life*, *via* intrinsic, embedded, machine learning algorithms. It could not be excluded that these kind of algorithmic agents "come up" with the "right rules;" that is, those rules which define the toy miniuniverse. It can be expected that if a machine learning algorithm performs excellent on particular problems then it necessarily has a degraded performance on the set of all remaining problems [31, 32].

In any case, the ways how physical theories by human individuals are created is not totally dissimilar from machine learning.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported in part by the European Union, Research Executive Agency (REA), Marie Curie FP7-PEOPLE-2010-IRSES-269151-RANPHYS grant.

Responsibility for the information and views expressed in this article lies entirely with the authors.

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

[1] Robert Kanigel, *The Man Who Knew Infinity: A Life of the Genius Ramanujan*, 5th ed. (Washington Square Press, 1991).

[2] Georg Kreisel, "Kurt Gödel. 28 April 1906-14 January 1978," Biographical memoirs of Fellows of the Royal Society **26**, 148–224 (1980), corrections *Ibid.* **27**, 697; *ibid.* **28**, 718.

[3] Sigmund Freud, in *Gesammelte Werke. Chronologisch geordnet. Achter Band. Werke aus den Jahren 1909–1913*, edited by Anna Freud, E. Bibring, W. Hoffer,

E. Kris, and O. Isakower (Fischer, Frankfurt am Main, 1999) Chap. Ratschläge für den Arzt bei der psychoanalytischen Behandlung, pp. 376–387.

[4] Edwin Thompson Jaynes, "Clearing up mysteries - the original goal," in *Maximum-Entropy and Bayesian Methods: Proceedings of the 8th Maximum Entropy Workshop, held on August 1-5, 1988, in St. John's College, Cambridge, England*, edited by John Skilling (Kluwer, Dordrecht, 1989) pp. 1–28.

[5] Edwin Thompson Jaynes, "Probability in quantum theory," in *Complexity, Entropy, and the Physics of Information: Proceedings of the 1988 Workshop on Complexity, Entropy, and the Physics of Information, held May - June, 1989, in Santa Fe, New Mexico*, edited by Wojciech Hubert Zurek (Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA, 1990) pp. 381–404.

[6] Alan M Turing, "Intelligent machinery, a heretical theory," Philosophia Mathematica **4**, 256–260 (1996).

[7] A. M. Turing, "Intelligent machinery," in *Cybernetics: Key Papers*, edited by C. R. Evans and A. D. J. Robertson (Butterworths, London, 1968) pp. 27–52.

[8] Ian Goodfellow, Yoshua Bengio, and Aaron Courville, "Deep learning," (2016), book in preparation for MIT Press.

[9] Mark E. Gold, "Language identification in the limit," Information and Control **10**, 447–474 (1967).

[10] Lenore Blum and Manuel Blum, "Toward a mathematical theory of inductive inference," Information and Control **28**, 125–155 (1975).

[11] Dana Angluin and Carl H. Smith, "Inductive inference: Theory and methods," ACM Computing Surveys **15**, 237–269 (1983).

[12] Leonard M. Adleman and M. Blum, "Inductive inference and unsolvability," The Journal of Symbolic Logic **56**, 891–900 (1991).

[13] Imre Lakatos, *Philosophical Papers. 1. The Methodology of Scientific Research Programmes* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1978).

[14] Kaggle Team, "The HiggsML challenge: When high energy physics meets machine learning," (2014), may-September 2014, accessed August 31, 2016.

[15] Louis-Francois Arsenault, O. Anatole von Lilienfeld, and Andrew J. Millis, "Machine learning for many-body physics: efficient solution of dynamical mean-field theory," (2015), arXiv:1506.08858.

[16] David N. Mermin, *Quantum Computer Science* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2007).

[17] Greg Egan, *Permutation City* (1994).

[18] Kurt Hornik, Maxwell Stinchcombe, and Halbert White, "Multilayer feedforward networks are universal approximators," Neural Networks **2**, 359–366 (1989).

[19] Kurt Hornik, Maxwell Stinchcombe, and Halbert White, "Universal approximation of an unknown function and its derivatives using multilayer feedforward networks," Neural Networks **3**, 551–560 (1990).

[20] Kurt Hornik, "Approximation capabilities of multilayer feedforward networks," Neural Networks **4**, 251–257 (1991).

[21] Qui Dong Wang, "Power series solutions and integral manifold of the n-body problem," Regular & Chaotic Dynamics **6**, 433–442 (2001).

[22] Karl Svozil, "Omega and the time evolution of the n-body problem," in *Randomness and Complexity, from Leibniz to Chaitin*, edited by Cristian S. Calude (World Scientific, Singapore, 2007) pp. 231–236, eprint arXiv:physics/0703031, arXiv:physics/0703031.

[23] Walter Terence Stace, "The refutation of realism," in *Readings in Philosophical Analysis*, edited by Herbert Feigl and Wilfrid Sellars (Appleton-Century-Crofts, New York, 1949) pp. 364–372, previously published in *Mind* **53**, 349-353 (1934).

[24] Cristian S. Calude and Giuseppe Longo, "The deluge of spurious correlations in big data," Foundations of Science , 1–18 (2016), CDMTCS-488.

[25] T. S. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, 2nd ed. (Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1970).

[26] Paul K. Feyerabend, *Against Method* (New Left Books, London, 1974).

[27] Paul Veyne, *Did the Greeks Believe in Their Myths? An Essay on the Constitutive Imagination* (University Of Chicago Press, 1988).

[28] Christopher A. Fuchs and Asher Peres, "Quantum theory needs no 'interpretation," Physics Today **53**, 70–71 (2000), further discussions of and reactions to the article can be found in the September issue of Physics Today, *53*, 11-14 (2000).

[29] Richard Phillips Feynman, *The Character of Physical Law* (MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 1965).

[30] Berthold-Georg Englert, "On quantum theory," The European Physical Journal D **67**, 1–16 (2013), arXiv:1308.5290.

[31] David H. Wolpert, "The lack of a priori distinctions between learning algorithms," Neural Computation **8**, 1341–1390 (1996).

[32] David H. Wolpert and William G. Macready, "No free lunch theorems for optimization," IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation **1**, 67–82 (1997).